



Formerly the Microelectronics Group of Lucent Technologies
9333 South John Young Parkway
Orlando, FL 32819-8698

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW
FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET

To: USPTO From: Fred Romano
Fax: 703-872-9319 Pages: (Including Cover Sheet)
Re: Chyns 15-6-9 Date: 1/28/02

Urgent! For Review Please Comment Please Reply

Comments:

2826
FAX COPY RECEIVED
JAN 28 2002
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

9333 S. JOHN YOUNG PARKWAY, ORLANDO FLORIDA 32819-8698
PHONE: 407-371-3250 FAX: 407-371-3781

The information contained in this facsimile transmission is an attorney-client privileged, confidential communication intended for the exclusive use of the intended recipient named above. If you are not the intended recipient, or are an employee or agent responsible for delivering this transmission to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this transmission is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify the sender immediately at the telephone number shown above and mail the original transmission to the above address. We will reimburse you for any reasonable expense you may incur in doing so. Thank you.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

**Patent Application**

Inventor(s) **Yih-Feng Chyan**
John Michael Hergenrother
Donald Paul Monroe

Case **15-6-9**

Serial No. **09/648,164**

Group Art Unit **2826**

Filing Date **August 25, 2000**

Examiner **Dickey, Thomas L.**

Title **Architecture for Circuit Connection Of A Vertical Transistor**

FAX COPY RECEIVED
JAN 28 2002

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

TRAVERSAL TO REQUIREMENT FOR RESTRICTION

SIR:

In response to the restriction requirement of November 29, 2001,
Applicant provisionally elects Group I, Claims 1-19 with traverse. The restriction
must be withdrawn for the following reasons.

The restriction is in error because the Examiner has read undue limitations
into Applicant's claims. That is, the sole basis for the restriction is that the
Examiner believes the invention of claim 20 could be formed in a trench or on a
rounded surface while the invention of claim 1 cannot. This conclusion only
results from a very narrow and limiting construction of the claim language. The
fact that a layer having a major surface may be formed along a plane does not
imply that the semiconductor surface of claim 1 is any more limiting than the
semiconductor surface of claim 20, or that formation of the various elements in a
trench or on a rounded surface is precluded. A rounded surface may be formed
along a plane.

Moreover, none of the distinctions presented by the Examiner result in a materially different product. If the Examiner believes otherwise the Examiner should provide support for this position. Further, the Examiner can provide a more comprehensive search of relevant art by not segregating the claims. Since it is useful to search classes corresponding to both groups of claims for examination of each group, there is no real basis for separately examining the claims.

Notwithstanding the insufficiency of the restriction requirement, the claims of Group II are patentably distinct over the claims of Group I because they are directed to a method of fabricating a device, which is different from the claims describing a device or circuit structure.

For all of these reasons removal of the restriction requirement is required.

If the Examiner has any questions regarding this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully,


Ferdinand M. Romano
Attorney for Applicant(s)
(407) 371-3250
Reg. No. 32752

Date: 2/28/02

Agere Systems Inc.
P. O. Box 614
Berkeley Heights, New Jersey 07922-0614

FAX COPY RECEIVED
JAN 28 2002

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800